

Imperial/TP/93-94/41
gr-qc/9405058

Unitarity Restoration in the Presence of Closed Timelike Curves

Arlen Anderson*

Isaac Newton Institute
20 Clarkson Road
Cambridge CB3 0EH, England

and

Blackett Laboratory
Imperial College
Prince Consort Rd.
London SW7 2BZ, England

and

Dept. of Physics and Astronomy[†]
UNC-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3255

May 25, 1994, revised Nov. 10, 1994

Abstract

A proposal is made for a mathematically unambiguous treatment of evolution in the presence of closed timelike curves. In contrast to other proposals for handling the naively nonunitary evolution that is often present in such situations, this proposal is causal, linear in the initial density matrix and preserves probability. It provides a physically reasonable interpretation of invertible nonunitary evolution by redefining the final Hilbert space so that the evolution is unitary or equivalently by removing the nonunitary part of the evolution operator using a polar decomposition.

*arley@physics.unc.edu

[†]Present Address

Evolution in spacetimes containing closed timelike curves has drawn much attention[1-8] recently following the work of Morris, Thorne and Yurtsever on the possibility of time machines[1]. Such a spacetime is not globally hyperbolic and therefore does not admit a foliation by spacelike hypersurfaces. Standard quantum field theory techniques cannot be applied. Nevertheless it has been proven that free field evolution on examples of such backgrounds is consistent and unitary while in the case of interacting fields, the evolution is apparently nonunitary[5-7]. The concept of nonunitary evolution is sufficiently disturbing that one might be tempted to dismiss these results out of hand. This would be a mistake as a closer study is repaid by a clearer understanding of *unitary* evolution.

There have been previous considerations of nonunitary evolution and proposals for how to interpret it. Jacobson argued that causality implies unitarity, and that there are ambiguities in computing expectation values for observables localized in regions spacelike separated from a region of nonunitary evolution[9]. The possibility was raised that a nonunitary Heisenberg formulation could be causal and unambiguous.

An unambiguous but acausal path integral interpretation based on the decoherence functional formalism was proposed by Friedman, Papastamatiou and Simon[5]. This was elaborated thoroughly by Hartle[8]. Both find that the presence of closed timelike curves in the future acausally affect the probabilities for observations in the present. In addition, the decoherence functional is nonlinear in the initial density matrix, and this represents a nonlinear (but unobservable) modification of standard quantum mechanics.

In this paper, after reviewing the discussions of Jacobson and Hartle, a proposal is made for an unambiguous and causal treatment of (invertible) nonunitary evolution which is linear in the initial density matrix. This proposal is given both in the language of states and as a decoherence functional. The resulting description in fact shows that the evolution is unitary when appropriately handled.

The essence of the proposal follows from the observation that in [5-7] the evolution X is identified as nonunitary because $XX^\dagger \neq 1$, but this is not sufficient to conclude nonunitarity in the sense of loss of probability [10]. A unitary operator U is defined[11] to be a linear operator from one Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_a$ onto a second $\mathcal{H}_b$ such that

$$\langle U\psi|U\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b} = \langle \psi|\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_a}, \quad (1)$$

for all $\psi, \phi \in \mathcal{H}_a$. Because all Hilbert spaces with a countable basis are isomorphic[11], it is conventional to write inner products formally without

stating their measure densities explicitly. Additionally, in standard quantum mechanical examples, the Hilbert space obtained after evolution is the same as the initial one and the inner products are the same. This combination of facts makes it easy to overlook that the final inner product and Hilbert space must be specified when defining the adjoint. $\langle X\psi|X\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_a}$ and $\langle X\psi|X\phi\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_b}$ are not the same unless $\mathcal{H}_a = \mathcal{H}_b$. Thus, X may not be unitary ($X^\dagger X \neq 1$) when the final Hilbert space is taken to be the same as the initial one, but nevertheless X is unitary in the sense of (1) for a suitably chosen final Hilbert space. The proposal for handling (invertible) naively nonunitary X is to work with the final Hilbert space where X is unitary. This is equivalent to remaining in the original Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_a$ but removing the nonunitary part of X through a polar decomposition $X = RU_X$, where U_X is unitary $U_X U_X^\dagger = 1$ and $R^2 = XX^\dagger$ is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_a$. Then, U_X is the manifestly unitary evolution operator in $\mathcal{H}_a$. This will be discussed in detail below.

One's initial concern with nonunitary evolution is that probability must not be conserved, and that therefore one cannot compute expectation values. A proposal to get around this is to simply renormalize expectation values by the (changing) non-unit norm of the state in which the expectation is taken

$$\langle P_\alpha \rangle = \frac{\langle \psi | P_\alpha | \psi \rangle}{\langle \psi | \psi \rangle}. \quad (2)$$

This gives a well-defined expectation value even when the norm of $\langle \psi | \psi \rangle$ is not unity. The difficulty with this proposal, as shown by Jacobson[9], is that it can give ambiguous results.

Consider a measurement of P_α made in a region A well-separated in a spacelike direction from a region of nonunitary evolution, for instance a region containing closed timelike curves (CTCs). The expectation value of P_α can be computed on either a spacelike hypersurface σ_- through A that passes before the CTC region or on a spacelike hypersurface σ_+ through A that passes after the CTC region. The wavefunction $|\psi\rangle$ is different on these two hypersurfaces and is related by the nonunitary evolution X_N through the CTC region

$$|\psi\rangle_+ = X_N |\psi\rangle_- \quad (3)$$

where the subscript labels the hypersurface on which the wavefunction is evaluated. The expectation value of P_α on σ_- is then

$$\langle P_\alpha \rangle_- = \frac{-\langle \psi | P_\alpha | \psi \rangle_-}{-\langle \psi | \psi \rangle_-}, \quad (4)$$

while on σ_+ , it is

$$\langle P_\alpha \rangle_+ = \frac{-\langle \psi | X_N^\dagger P_\alpha X_N | \psi \rangle_-}{-\langle \psi | X_N^\dagger X_N | \psi \rangle_-}. \quad (5)$$

Since the observable P_α is measured in the same region on both slices, it has not changed under evolution, that is, $X_N^{-1} P_\alpha X_N = P_\alpha$. This implies that

$$\langle P_\alpha \rangle_+ = \frac{-\langle \psi | X_N^\dagger X_N P_\alpha | \psi \rangle_-}{-\langle \psi | X_N^\dagger X_N | \psi \rangle_-}, \quad (6)$$

which is not equal to $\langle P_\alpha \rangle_-$ unless $X_N^\dagger X_N = 1$. Thus, for this proposal, nonunitary evolution leads to ambiguous predictions for expectation values of observables even in regions spacelike separated from the region of nonunitary evolution.

A different proposal[8] using a decoherence functional in Gell-Mann and Hartle's generalized quantum mechanics[12, 13] succeeds in avoiding this ambiguity. The decoherence functional measures the interference between histories characterized by strings of projections. The projections serve to divide the set of fine-grained histories into coarser-grained classes. The decoherence functional can be computed as a closed-time-path functional integral over histories which start from an initial density matrix, pass forward through one sequence of projections up to a final surface, and then back through a different set. With no final condition, one traces over a final surface. In the Heisenberg picture of the unitary case, projection operators on a space-like slice σ_k can be expressed in terms of the unitary evolution $U(\sigma_k, \sigma_a)$ of projection operators defined on an initial slice σ_i

$$P_{\alpha_k}^{(k)}(\sigma_k) = U^{-1}(\sigma_k, \sigma_i) P_{\alpha_k}^{(k)} U(\sigma_k, \sigma_i). \quad (7)$$

An overall unitary operator evolving from the initial surface σ_i to the final surface σ_f cancels by cyclicity of the trace and the decoherence functional is left as a trace over the initial hypersurface

$$D(\alpha', \alpha) = \text{Tr} \left(P_{\alpha'_n}^{(n)}(\sigma_n) \cdots P_{\alpha'_1}^{(1)}(\sigma_1) \rho_i P_{\alpha_1}^{(1)\dagger}(\sigma_1) \cdots P_{\alpha_n}^{(n)\dagger}(\sigma_n) \right). \quad (8)$$

In the non-unitary case discussed above, there is a region bounded by σ_+ and σ_- containing a non-unitary evolution X_N . This evolution must be included in the decoherence functional: X_N is inserted in the sequence of projections where it takes place. Projections before σ_- are expressed in the

Heisenberg picture in terms of the initial hypersurface σ_i , and those after σ_+ in terms of projections on the final hypersurface σ_f

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\alpha_k}^{(k)}(\sigma_k) &= U^{-1}(\sigma_k, \sigma_i) P_{\alpha_k}^{(k)} U(\sigma_k, \sigma_i), & \sigma_k < \sigma_- \\ P_{\alpha_k}^{(k)}(\sigma_k) &= U^{-1}(\sigma_k, \sigma_f) P_{\alpha_k}^{(k)} U(\sigma_k, \sigma_f), & \sigma_k > \sigma_+. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

To make the transition between the initial and final surfaces, one uses the full evolution

$$X = U(\sigma_f, \sigma_+) X_N U(\sigma_-, \sigma_i). \quad (10)$$

Additionally, the decoherence functional must be renormalized to account for the nonunitary evolution of the initial density matrix in the absence of coarse-graining. The proposed decoherence functional in the case of one projection made before the CTC region is[8]

$$D_-(\alpha', \alpha) = \frac{\text{Tr} \left(X P_{\alpha'}^{(1)}(\sigma_1) \rho_i P_{\alpha}^{(1)\dagger}(\sigma_1) X^\dagger \right)}{\text{Tr} \left(X \rho_i X^\dagger \right)}. \quad (11)$$

For the case of one projection made after the CTC region, it would be

$$D_+(\alpha', \alpha) = \frac{\text{Tr} \left(P_{\alpha'}^{(1)}(\sigma_1) X \rho_i X^\dagger P_{\alpha}^{(1)\dagger}(\sigma_1) \right)}{\text{Tr} \left(X \rho_i X^\dagger \right)}. \quad (12)$$

Now, if the projection is made in a region spacelike separated from the CTC region, then as above P_α commutes with X and one sees that $D_-(\alpha', \alpha) = D_+(\alpha', \alpha)$. There is no ambiguity. It has disappeared because both computations are aware of the full future history, and in particular of the presence of the CTC region.

This proposal has a curious property however. The result of computing the decoherence functional is different in the presence of X than it is in its absence. If we are living in the past of a CTC region, we might naively compute with a decoherence function which did not include X . Our predictions would be different than they would be if we included a nonunitary X . If the correct physical description involved X , the difference between physical results and our no- X predictions would in principle be susceptible to experimental detection. With this decoherence functional, the future existence of a CTC region acausally affects the accuracy of predictions today. This is a strange result, but very important if true.

A second unusual feature of this decoherence functional (and indeed the earlier proposal) is that it is nonlinear in the initial density matrix. That is, because the trace of the initial density matrix appears in the denominator, one cannot add different initial density matrices. This is therefore a nonlinear modification of conventional quantum mechanics. Arguably in a closed-system formulation of the wavefunction of the universe, we would not be sensitive to this in any event as we only see linearity in the superpositions of subsystems, each of which are part of the full initial density matrix.

There is however an alternative. A new proposal leads to both unambiguous results and is causal and linear. This proposal is based on the observation that a linear invertible transformation X , such that $XX^\dagger \neq 1$, is not a unitary transformation from the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_a$ to itself, but it is a unitary transformation to a new Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_b$ [10]. The states obtained by unitary evolution with X are elements of $\mathcal{H}_b$, and they must be transformed back to $\mathcal{H}_a$ if one is to compare with the physical states defined there. After this is done, one finds that these evolved states are simply those obtained by evolving with the unitary part U_X of a polar decomposition of $X = RU_X$ [where $R = (XX^\dagger)^{1/2}$ is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_a$]. Unitarity is restored by removing the nonunitary part of X . This proposal can be implemented both in the language of states and expectation values and in the decoherence functional.

The manipulations needed to elaborate the proposal can all be performed symbolically, but for clarity and familiarity, the case of quantum mechanics is treated explicitly first. In the language of states, one has to be careful about the form of the inner product when it is computed on different hypersurfaces after evolution. The inner product on an initial hypersurface σ_i for states in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_a$ is

$$\begin{aligned} {}_{(\mu_a)}\langle\phi, i|\psi, i\rangle &= \int_{\sigma_i} dx \phi^* \mu_a \psi \\ &= {}_{(1)}\langle\phi, i|\mu_a|\psi, i\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where the (possibly operator-valued) measure density in the inner product is pre-subscripted parenthetically. (The measure density is put in front to emphasize that it is more naturally associated with the bra-vectors than the kets.) Let $|\tilde{\psi}, f\rangle = X|\psi, i\rangle$ be the state on the final hypersurface σ_f obtained by evolving an initial state on σ_i with X —the tilde indicates that this is a state in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_b$. Requiring that the value of the inner product be preserved when evaluated on the hypersurface σ_f , one has

$${}_{(\mu_a)}\langle\phi, i|\psi, i\rangle = \int_{\sigma_i} dx (X^{-1}\tilde{\phi})^* \mu_a X^{-1}\tilde{\psi}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{\sigma_f} dx \tilde{\phi}^* X^{-1\dagger_1} \mu_a X^{-1} \tilde{\psi} \\
&= \int_{\sigma_f} dx \tilde{\phi}^* \mu_a X^{-1\dagger_a} X^{-1} \tilde{\psi} \\
&= \int_{\sigma_f} dx \tilde{\phi}^* \mu_b \tilde{\psi} = {}_{(\mu_b)} \langle \tilde{\phi}, f | \tilde{\psi}, f \rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The induced measure density of the unitarily equivalent inner product is

$$\mu_b = (X^{-1})^{\dagger_1} \mu_a X^{-1} = \mu_a (X X^{\dagger_a})^{-1}. \tag{15}$$

The notation $\dagger_1$ indicates that the adjoint is computed in the trivial measure density $\mu = 1$. Note that this adjoint is related to the adjoint in the measure density μ_a by

$$X^{\dagger_1} \mu_a = \mu_a X^{\dagger_a}. \tag{16}$$

One sees that to preserve the inner product the measure density changes during the evolution, acquiring an inhomogeneous factor $(X X^{\dagger_a})^{-1}$ measuring the nonunitarity of X .

A side remark may prevent potential confusion. Consider the (nonrelativistic) quantum mechanics of a particle propagating in a time-dependent curved background. The measure density μ_a is the square-root of the determinant of the metric and therefore is time-dependent. Nevertheless it is specified once for the whole spacetime and the form of the inner product never changes; on each hypersurface where one computes the inner product, one evaluates μ_a at that instant of time. Here, the transformation to μ_b reflecting the nonunitarity of X is on top of any time-dependence μ_a may already have. It is a genuine change to a different Hilbert space.

Having found the Hilbert space in which X is unitary, we must face the fact that it is not the Hilbert space we naively expected. Our usual association between mathematical and physical quantities is made with the presumption of a particular Hilbert space. We know what physics means in the usual Hilbert space, and we would be surprised if it made a difference to be told that there had been “nonunitary” evolution in our past and that the Hilbert space at present is not the one we naively thought! Fortunately, we needn’t worry: the choice of measure density/Hilbert space is on the same par as a choice of coordinates; you can freely change it when talking about physical quantities. We just need to find the transformation from μ_b to μ_a .

Let $R = (X X^{\dagger_a})^{1/2}$. Then $R = R^{\dagger_a}$ is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_a$. Returning to the computation in Eq. (14), one sees that defining

$$|\psi, f\rangle = R^{-1} |\tilde{\psi}, f\rangle, \tag{17}$$

resets the measure to μ_a ,

$$\int_{\sigma_f} dx \tilde{\phi}^* \mu_a R^{-2} \tilde{\psi} = \int_{\sigma_f} dx \phi^* \mu_a \psi. \quad (18)$$

But this means that the evolved state in $\mathcal{H}_a$ is

$$|\psi, f\rangle = R^{-1} X |\psi, i\rangle = U_X |\psi, i\rangle. \quad (19)$$

It is easy to check that U_X is unitary in $\mathcal{H}_a$ ($U_X U_X^\dagger = U_X^\dagger U_X = 1$)! This, $X = R U_X$, is the polar decomposition of X in $\mathcal{H}_a$. The restoration of unitarity is explicit.

Under the transformation (17) from $\mathcal{H}_b$ to $\mathcal{H}_a$ on the final surface, the self-adjoint observable $\tilde{P}_\alpha = \tilde{P}_\alpha^{\dagger_b}$ in $\mathcal{H}_b$ becomes

$$P_\alpha = R^{-1} \tilde{P}_\alpha R, \quad (20)$$

which is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_a$. With this in mind, one can turn to consider “non-unitary” evolution in the Heisenberg picture. The naive Heisenberg evolution of the operator P_α is $X^{-1} P_\alpha X$. Unfortunately this cannot be correct because $X^{-1} P_\alpha X$ is not self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_a$ (that is, on the initial hypersurface). This should not be surprising.

Heisenberg evolution works by pulling back operators from the final surface to the initial surface. If $\tilde{P}_\alpha$ is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_b$ on the final surface, then it is easy to confirm that its pull-back is self-adjoint on the initial surface in $\mathcal{H}_a$

$$\begin{aligned} X^{-1} \tilde{P}_\alpha X = X^{-1} \tilde{P}_\alpha^{\dagger_b} X &= X^{-1} \mu_b^{-1} \tilde{P}_\alpha^{\dagger_1} \mu_b X \\ &= \mu_a^{-1} X^{\dagger_1} \tilde{P}_\alpha^{\dagger_1} (X^{-1})^{\dagger_1} \mu_a \\ &= (X^{-1} \tilde{P}_\alpha X)^{\dagger_a}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Using Eq. (20), this implies the Heisenberg evolution of P_α is

$$X^{-1} \tilde{P}_\alpha X = U_X^{-1} P_\alpha U_X. \quad (22)$$

Heisenberg evolution is accomplished using the unitary part of the polar decomposition of X .

Sandwiching this Heisenberg operator between initial states, one sees that one has what one wants—the expectation of P_α in $\mathcal{H}_a$ on the final surface,

$${}_{(\mu_a)} \langle \psi, i | U_X^{-1} P_\alpha U_X | \psi, i \rangle = {}_{(\mu_a)} \langle \psi, f | P_\alpha | \psi, f \rangle. \quad (23)$$

From another perspective this result is natural: in the Heisenberg picture, one does not have the freedom to change the Hilbert space, so to restore unitarity one must change one's identification of the evolved observable.

One might be concerned that the nonlinear operation involved in removing the nonunitary part would prevent one from composing X with a further unitary operator, say U_Y . Let $Z = U_Y X$ be such a composition, then

$$\begin{aligned} U_Z &= (ZZ^{\dagger a})^{-1/2} Z \\ &= (U_Y R^2 U_Y^{-1})^{-1/2} U_Y R U_X \\ &= U_Y U_X. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Here one can use $U_Y R^2 U_Y^{-1} = (U_Y R U_Y^{-1})^2$ before taking the square root, but it is generally true that $f(U_Y R U_Y^{-1}) = U_Y f(R) U_Y^{-1}$. Unitary composition works as one expects and there is no change to ordinary quantum theory in regions with unitary evolution.

If the expectation value of an operator P_α is computed on the initial hypersurface σ_i , one finds

$${}_{(\mu_a)}\langle P_\alpha \rangle = {}_{(1)}\langle \psi, i | \mu_a P_\alpha | \psi, i \rangle. \tag{25}$$

On the final hypersurface σ_f , the “push-forward” of P_α is $X P_\alpha X^{-1}$ which is assumed here to remain P_α . Its expectation value on σ_f is then

$$\begin{aligned} {}_{(\mu_b)}\langle X P_\alpha X^{-1} \rangle &= {}_{(\mu_b)}\langle P_\alpha \rangle \\ &= {}_{(\mu_b)}\langle \tilde{\psi}, f | X P_\alpha X^{-1} | \tilde{\psi}, f \rangle \\ &= \left({}_{(1)}\langle \psi, i | X^{\dagger 1} \right) \left((X^{-1})^{\dagger 1} \mu_a X^{-1} \right) \left(X P_\alpha X^{-1} \right) \left(X | \psi, i \right) \\ &= {}_{(1)}\langle \psi, i | \mu_a P_\alpha | \psi, i \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

This agrees with the result computed on σ_i and there is no ambiguity. As well, the state does not appear in the denominator and expectation values take their usual linear quantum mechanics form. Finally, the result does not know of the presence or absence of X and is not acausally affected by CTC regions.

Turn now to quantum field theory. To quantize a field, one begins in a non-interacting initial region and solves the (initial) free wave operator L_i for its modes, say $L_i u_j = 0$. The modes are normalized in an inner product of the form (13). The wave operator is self-adjoint in the measure density of the inner product. Using a scalar field as an example, the quantum field

is expanded in terms of the modes with creation and annihilation operator coefficients

$$\Phi = \sum_j a_j u_j + a_j^{\dagger a} u_j^*. \quad (27)$$

The vacuum is defined as the state annihilated by all the a_j , and the n-particle states are formed by applying a product of creation operators to the vacuum.

The next step is to compute new mode function for the (final) free wave operator in a non-interacting final region. In the original measure density μ_a , this operator is L_f , the usual free wave operator evaluated in the final region. It has modes v_k . If a nonunitary evolution X takes place and the measure density in the final region has changed (15), then L_f is not the self-adjoint free wave operator in μ_b , but instead $\tilde{L}_f = R L_f R^{-1}$ is. The mode functions $\tilde{v}_k$ of $\tilde{L}_f$ are related to those of L_f by

$$v_k = R^{-1} \tilde{v}_k. \quad (28)$$

This corresponds to Eq. (17) above.

Take the non-interacting case first. To compute the S-matrix, the initial modes u_j are evolved into the final region by X where they may then be expanded in terms of the complete set of modes $\tilde{v}_k$ (and $\tilde{v}_k^*$). Bogoliubov coefficients are calculated in the usual way using the inner product with measure density μ_b . The S-matrix is necessarily unitary because the inner products of states are preserved by the evolution and because the basis of final mode functions is complete. Alternatively, if one chooses to work always in the original familiar Hilbert space, one simply uses the final mode functions v_k , evolves the initial modes with $U_X = R^{-1} X$ and computes Bogoliubov coefficients using the inner product with μ_a .

In the interacting case, attention shifts away from evolution of the mode functions to the detailed correspondence between initial and final n-particle states. The evolution operator X can be formally expressed as

$$X = \sum_{\{\tilde{n}\}, \{m\}} a_{\tilde{n}m} |\tilde{n}, f\rangle_{(\mu_a)} \langle m, i|. \quad (29)$$

The $\tilde{n}$ is short-hand for the detailed structure of the n-particle states associated with the $\tilde{v}_k$ modes, and m represents m-particle states associated with the u_j modes. If X is not unitary in $\mathcal{H}_a$, then

$$X X^{\dagger a} = R^2 \neq 1, \quad (30)$$

where $R = R^{\dagger a}$ is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_a$. Multiplying this equation on the right and left by R^{-1} , one finds it defines a unitary transition matrix $U_X = R^{-1}X$. This matrix is the S-matrix for the interacting theory and is unitary by construction. It is non-trivial if U_X is not the identity. Unitarity has again been restored by removing the nonunitary part of the evolution operator.

For completeness, I remark that it follows from Eqs. (15) and (30) that

$$X^{\dagger b}X = XX^{\dagger a} = R^2 \neq 1. \quad (31)$$

Thus, R is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_b$ as well as $\mathcal{H}_a$. Multiplying by R^{-1} on the left and the right, one finds that $\tilde{U}_X = XR^{-1}$ is unitary in $\mathcal{H}_b$. This explains the role of the second polar decomposition $X = \tilde{U}_XR$: it provides the unitary operator for evolution which remains in $\mathcal{H}_b$.

This story can be retold in the decoherence functional formulation. There, unitarity is restored by appropriate definition of the trace. The trace in the decoherence functional is taken over a final hypersurface. One must make sure that it is the trace which is physically equivalent to one defined on an initial surface, say before the CTC region. This can be done by requiring that the trace of ρ_i is preserved under the evolution. On an initial hypersurface σ_i , the measure density is μ_a and the trace is

$$\text{Tr}_{(\mu_a)}(\rho_i) = \text{Tr}_{(1)}(\rho_i\mu_a). \quad (32)$$

On the final hypersurface σ_f , the measure density changes to μ_b and one takes the trace of the evolved density matrix $X\rho_iX^{\dagger b}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_{(\mu_b)}(X\rho_iX^{\dagger b}) &= \text{Tr}_{(1)}(X\rho_i\mu_bX^{\dagger b}) \\ &= \text{Tr}_{(1)}(X\rho_iX^{\dagger 1}\mu_b). \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

The traces of ρ_i on σ_i and σ_f are equal if

$$\mu_b = (X^{-1})^{\dagger 1}\mu_aX^{-1} = \mu_a(XX^{\dagger a})^{-1} = \mu_a(X^{\dagger b}X)^{-1}, \quad (34)$$

as above. It is important to emphasize that care must be taken with the use of the different types of adjoint as one changes the hypersurface/Hilbert space where one is taking the trace and as one adjusts whether the measure density is implicit or explicit.

I remark that the trace of ρ_i^2 is also preserved

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_{(\mu_a)}(\rho_i^2) &= \text{Tr}_{(1)}(\rho_i\mu_a\rho_i\mu_a) \\ &= \text{Tr}_{(1)}(X\rho_iX^{\dagger 1}\mu_bX\rho_iX^{\dagger 1}\mu_b) \\ &= \text{Tr}_{(\mu_b)}((X\rho_iX^{\dagger b})^2). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Thus, this proposal does not provide an interpretation for evolutions which are not invertible in which a pure state evolves to a mixed state. Such an evolution would not be described by $X\rho_i X^{\dagger b}$, but the point is emphasized so that there should be no mistake.

The decoherence functional for one projection made on the hypersurfaces σ_1 and σ_2 before and after the CTC region is given by

$$\begin{aligned} D(\alpha', \beta'; \alpha, \beta) &= \\ &= \text{Tr}_{(\mu_b)} \left(\tilde{P}_{\alpha'}^{(2)}(\sigma_2) X P_{\beta'}^{(1)}(\sigma_1) \rho_i P_{\beta}^{(1)\dagger b}(\sigma_1) X^{\dagger b} \tilde{P}_{\alpha}^{(2)\dagger b}(\sigma_2) \right) \\ &= \text{Tr}_{(1)} \left(\tilde{P}_{\alpha'}^{(2)}(\sigma_2) X P_{\beta'}^{(1)}(\sigma_1) \rho_i P_{\beta}^{(1)\dagger 1}(\sigma_1) X^{\dagger 1} \tilde{P}_{\alpha}^{(2)\dagger 1}(\sigma_2) \mu_b \right). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The projection operators are in the Heisenberg picture as defined in Eq. (9). This means that $P_{\alpha}^{(1)}(\sigma_1)$ is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_a$ on the initial hypersurface while $\tilde{P}_{\alpha}^{(2)}(\sigma_2)$ is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_b$ on the final hypersurface. In the first form, the trace is evaluated on the final surface in $\mathcal{H}_b$. The second form makes the dependence on the measure density explicit. This satisfies Hartle's axioms[13] for a decoherence functional.

By using Eq. (34), the decoherence functional can be expressed in terms of a trace in $\mathcal{H}_a$ on the initial hypersurface,

$$\begin{aligned} D(\alpha', \beta'; \alpha, \beta) &= \\ &= \text{Tr}_{(1)} \left(\tilde{P}_{\alpha'}^{(2)}(\sigma_2) X P_{\beta'}^{(1)}(\sigma_1) \rho_i P_{\beta}^{(1)\dagger 1}(\sigma_1) X^{\dagger 1} \tilde{P}_{\alpha}^{(2)\dagger 1}(\sigma_2) (X^{-1})^{\dagger 1} \mu_a X^{-1} \right). \\ &= \text{Tr}_{(\mu_a)} \left(X^{-1} \tilde{P}_{\alpha'}^{(2)}(\sigma_2) X P_{\beta'}^{(1)}(\sigma_1) \rho_i P_{\beta}^{(1)\dagger a}(\sigma_1) (X^{-1} \tilde{P}_{\alpha}^{(2)}(\sigma_2) X)^{\dagger a} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

The effect of the change in measure has been to pull back the projection operator $\tilde{P}_{\alpha}^{(2)}(\sigma_2)$ to the initial hypersurface by the adjoint action of X^{-1} . Since $(X^{-1})^{\dagger 1} \mu_a X = \mu_a R^{-2}$, the decoherence functional can be reexpressed as a trace in $\mathcal{H}_a$ on the final hypersurface

$$\begin{aligned} D(\alpha', \beta'; \alpha, \beta) &= \\ &= \text{Tr}_{(1)} \left(\tilde{P}_{\alpha'}^{(2)}(\sigma_2) X P_{\beta'}^{(1)}(\sigma_1) \rho_i P_{\beta}^{(1)\dagger 1}(\sigma_1) X^{\dagger 1} \tilde{P}_{\alpha}^{(2)\dagger 1}(\sigma_2) \mu_a R^{-2} \right). \\ &= \text{Tr}_{(\mu_a)} \left(\tilde{P}_{\alpha'}^{(2)}(\sigma_2) X P_{\beta'}^{(1)}(\sigma_1) \rho_i P_{\beta}^{(1)\dagger a}(\sigma_1) X^{\dagger a} \tilde{P}_{\alpha}^{(2)\dagger a}(\sigma_2) R^{-2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

There is a factor R^{-2} present here that is not in the naive decoherence functional, cf. the numerator of Eq. (12). A more subtle but equally important difference is that the projection operator after the CTC region is

$\tilde{P}_\alpha^{(2)}(\sigma_2)$ which is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_b$, not $\mathcal{H}_a$! Using Eq. (20) to transform to the projection operator $P_\alpha^{(2)}(\sigma_2)$ which is self-adjoint in $\mathcal{H}_a$, the expression for the decoherence functional is found

$$D(\alpha', \beta'; \alpha, \beta) = \text{Tr}_{(\mu_a)} \left(\tilde{P}_{\alpha'}^{(2)}(\sigma_2) U_X P_{\beta'}^{(1)}(\sigma_1) \rho_i P_\beta^{(1)\dagger a}(\sigma_1) U_X^{\dagger a} P_\alpha^{(2)\dagger a}(\sigma_2) \right). \quad (39)$$

This clearly shows that the mechanism for unitarity restoration is to replace the nonunitary evolution X by its unitary part U_X .

Finally, the trace in the decoherence functional can be shifted to the initial hypersurface by inserting $U_X U_X^{-1} = 1$ at the end of the trace. Using cyclicity, one sees that the decoherence functional is built from the Heisenberg evolved projection operators (22)

$$\begin{aligned} D(\alpha', \beta'; \alpha, \beta) &= \\ &= \text{Tr}_{(\mu_a)} \left(U_X^{-1} P_{\alpha'}^{(2)}(\sigma_2) U_X P_{\beta'}^{(1)}(\sigma_1) \rho_i P_\beta^{(1)\dagger a}(\sigma_1) (U_X^{-1} \tilde{P}_\alpha^{(2)}(\sigma_2) U_X)^{\dagger a} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Working with Eq. (37), one can consider a few cases to discover the dependence of the decoherence functional on X . Suppose first that there is only a projection before the CTC region so that $\tilde{P}_\alpha^{(2)}(\sigma_2)$ and $\tilde{P}_{\alpha'}^{(2)}(\sigma_2)$ are not present. Then, the X factors cancel and there is no dependence on X . A CTC region in the future does not acausally affect prediction made in the present. Alternatively, suppose that $\tilde{P}_\alpha^{(2)}(\sigma_2)$ and $\tilde{P}_{\alpha'}^{(2)}(\sigma_2)$ are in a region spacelike separated from the CTC region so that they commute with X . Again the X factors cancel and the CTC region has no acausal effect. Only if $\tilde{P}_\alpha^{(2)}(\sigma_2)$ does not commute with X will there be an effect. This presumably can happen if $\tilde{P}_\alpha^{(2)}(\sigma_2)$ is in the causal future of the CTC region.

One can also compute probabilities for alternatives in the CTC region by inserting projection operators between periods of nonunitary evolution. These alternatives must of course be members of an exhaustive and exclusive set. Because there is not a spacelike hypersurface which intersects the CTC region, it is not clear how to describe such a computation in terms of states at the instant projection is made. The computation can be made in the Heisenberg picture by pulling the projection operator back to the initial hypersurface and computing the expectation value there, as in Eq. (37).

It should be mentioned that one cannot necessarily detect CTC regions in one's past because experimentally we only have access to an effective initial density matrix. Our effective initial density matrix may have been renormalized by X from the true initial density matrix, but we would not

be able to detect this without knowing the initial density matrix. On the other hand, if one has a theory for the initial condition of the universe, as in the Hartle-Hawking no-boundary proposal, predictions based on this initial condition could differ depending on the presence or absence of CTC regions and this might be detectable. Otherwise, the best means of detecting a CTC region is to measure a change in amplitudes as one evolves past it—in this way, one could compare results before and after and see a possible difference due to the noncommutativity with X . Sadly, there seems little likelihood of an experimental test of this kind.

For completeness, one can consider a time-symmetric decoherence functional in which a final state density matrix is also imposed. The objective here is to verify the time symmetry of the decoherence functional in the presence of nonunitary evolution. The subtlety in this is again taking care with the hypersurface on which the trace is evaluated. To be completely explicit, consider a situation in which an evolution X from an initial surface σ_a to an intermediate surface σ_1 is followed by a projection $P_\alpha^{(1)}$ and then by subsequent evolution Y to a final surface σ_b . (Note that in contrast to the discussion above, the projection operator is in the Schrödinger picture and the intermediate evolutions are included explicitly as X and Y .) Neither X nor Y will be assumed to be unitary. To be clear about the definition of adjoints, let μ_a be the (coordinate-valued) measure density on the initial surface σ_a . The adjoint $\dagger_a$ on σ_a is defined by $\mu_a X^{\dagger_a} = X^{\dagger_1} \mu_a$ and the adjoint $\dagger_b$ is defined similarly on the final surface using the measure density μ_b . The projection is self-adjoint $P_\alpha^{(1)} = P_\alpha^{(1)\dagger(1)}$ on the intermediate surface where it is defined, using the induced measure density $\mu_{(1)}$ there[14].

On the final hypersurface the decoherence functional is

$$\begin{aligned}
D(\alpha'; \alpha) &= \frac{\text{Tr}_{(\mu_b)} \left(\rho_f Y P_{\alpha'}^{(1)} X \rho_i X^{\dagger_b} P_\alpha^{(1)\dagger_b} Y^{\dagger_b} \right)}{\text{Tr}_{(\mu_b)} \left(\rho_f Y X \rho_i X^{\dagger_b} Y^{\dagger_b} \right)} \\
&= \frac{\text{Tr}_{(1)} \left(\rho_f \mu_b Y P_{\alpha'}^{(1)} X \rho_i X^{\dagger_1} P_\alpha^{(1)\dagger_1} Y^{\dagger_1} \mu_b \right)}{\text{Tr}_{(1)} \left(\rho_f \mu_b Y X \rho_i X^{\dagger_1} Y^{\dagger_1} \mu_b \right)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

The final density matrix acquires a factor of the measure density when one introduces the measure explicitly. This is easily confirmed with a calculation in terms of states where a trace over two density matrices leads to a product of two inner products and hence requires two measure density factors. Using the

transformation formula for the measure density, $\mu_b = (YX)^{-1\dagger_1} \mu_a (YX)^{-1}$, the denominator is seen to be symmetric

$$\text{Tr}_{(1)} \left(\rho_f \mu_b Y X \rho_i X^{\dagger_1} Y^{\dagger_1} \mu_b \right) = \text{Tr}_{(1)} \left(\rho_i \mu_a X^{-1} Y^{-1} \rho_f (Y^{-1})^{\dagger_1} (X^{-1})^{\dagger_1} \mu_a \right). \quad (42)$$

The time-symmetry of the numerator is slightly more difficult to establish due to subtlety with the adjoints. Two side results are needed. First, the inverse and adjoint ($\dagger_1$) operations commute

$$(X^{-1})^{\dagger_1} = (X^{\dagger_1})^{-1}, \quad (43)$$

which follows by taking the adjoint of $XX^{-1} = 1$. Next, self-adjointness of $P_\alpha^{(1)}$ on the intermediate surface implies self-adjointness of the projection pulled back to the initial surface $X^{-1}P_\alpha^{(1)}X$ when the measure density transforms appropriately for nonunitary X , cf. Eq. (21). Note however that $P_\alpha^{(1)} \neq P_\alpha^{(1)\dagger_a}$ if X is not unitary.

In the numerator of (41), consider the factor $\mu_b Y P_{\alpha'}^{(1)} X$. This can be reexpressed with μ_a on the right on transforming the measure and using the computation (21)

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_b Y X (X^{-1} P_{\alpha'}^{(1)} X) &= ((YX)^{-1})^{\dagger_1} \mu_a \mu_a^{-1} X^{\dagger_1} P_{\alpha'}^{(1)\dagger_1} (X^{-1})^{\dagger_1} \mu_a \\ &= (Y^{-1})^{\dagger_1} P_{\alpha'}^{(1)\dagger_1} (X^{-1})^{\dagger_1} \mu_a. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Similarly, one has

$$X^{\dagger_1} P_\alpha^{(1)\dagger_1} Y^{\dagger_1} \mu_b = \mu_a X^{-1} P_\alpha^{(1)} Y^{-1}. \quad (45)$$

These can be combined to show that the numerator of the final equality in (41) is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_{(1)} \left(\rho_f (Y^{-1})^{\dagger_1} P_{\alpha'}^{(1)\dagger_1} (X^{-1})^{\dagger_1} \mu_a \rho_i \mu_a X^{-1} P_\alpha^{(1)} Y^{-1} \right) &= \\ &= \text{Tr}_{(\mu_a)} \left(\rho_i X^{-1} P_\alpha^{(1)} Y^{-1} \rho_f (Y^{-1})^{\dagger_a} P_\alpha^{(1)\dagger_a} (X^{-1})^{\dagger_a} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

This is the time-symmetric form of the numerator, and one concludes that the decoherence functional with initial and final density matrices is time-symmetric.

To summarize, it has been shown that evolution by an invertible “nonunitary” operator X with $XX^{\dagger_a} = R^2 \neq 1$ can be made unitary by transforming

the measure density on the final hypersurface appropriately, Eq. (15). Equivalently, one can stay in the original Hilbert space by removing the nonunitary part of X to obtain the unitary evolution operator $U_X = R^{-1}X$. Both procedures lead to unambiguous results for the expectation values of observables. The results are causal and do not involve nonlinear modifications of quantum mechanics. This proposal for handling nonunitary evolution can be stated in the form of a decoherence functional in the language of Gell-Mann and Hartle generalized quantum mechanics. The decoherence functional with initial and final density matrices imposed as conditions is time-symmetric.

The conclusion is that one can consistently make quantum mechanical computations in spacetimes containing closed timelike curves without loss of probability or causality if evolution is described by an invertible nonunitary operator. A region of closed timelike curves could only be detected if one interacted with something in its causal future.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank D. Craig, D. Deutsch, J. Hartle, D. Politzer, S. Rosenberg, J. Whelan and the other participants of the workshop on closed timelike curves at the Isaac Newton Institute for many stimulating discussions, and C. Fewster, J. Friedman and T. Jacobson for further helpful conversations.

References

- [1] M. Morris, K. Thorne, and U. Yurtsever, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1446 (1988); F. Echeverria, G. Klinkhammer, and K.S. Thorne, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 1077 (1991).
- [2] J.L. Friedman and M. Morris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 401 (1991); J. Friedman, M. Morris, I.D. Novikov, F. Echeverria, G. Klinkhammer, K.S. Thorne, and U. Yurtsever, Phys. Rev. **D42**, 1915 (1990).
- [3] D. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 3197 (1991).
- [4] J.L. Friedman, N.J. Papastamatiou, and J.Z. Simon, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 4441 (1992).
- [5] J.L. Friedman, N.J. Papastamatiou, and J.Z. Simon, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 4456 (1992).
- [6] D. Boulware, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 4421 (1992).

- [7] H.D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 4470 (1992).
- [8] J.B. Hartle, UCSB preprint (1994).
- [9] T. Jacobson, in *Conceptual Problems of Quantum Gravity*, edited by A. Ashtekar and J. Stachel, Birkhäuser, Boston (1991).
- [10] A. Anderson, Phys. Lett. B **305**, 67 (1993).
- [11] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, 1: Functional Analysis*, rev. and enlarged edition, Academic Press, Boston (1980), p. 39.
- [12] M. Gell-Mann and J.B. Hartle in *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information, SFI Studies in the Sciences of Complexity*, vol. VIII, edited by W. Zurek, Addison-Wesley, Reading or in *Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium on the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics in the Light of New Technology*, edited by S. Kobayashi, H. Ezawa, Y. Murayama, and S. Nomura, Physical Society of Japan, Tokyo (1990).
- [13] J.B. Hartle, in *Quantum Cosmology and Baby Universes: Proceedings of the 1989 Jerusalem Winter School for Theoretical Physics*, edited by S. Coleman, J.B. Hartle, T. Piran, and S. Weinberg, World Scientific, Singapore (1991), pp. 65-157; in *Proceedings of the 1992 Les Houches Summer School Gravitation and Quantizations* (preprint UCSBTH92-21).
- [14] The projection is assumed to be defined on a spacelike hypersurface. In the broader context of generalized quantum mechanics where projections may be onto regions of spacetime, greater care must be taken in defining the adjoint.